

SPEECH OF

HON. R. S. BALDWIN,

AT A WHIG MEETING HELD AT THE EXCHANGE HALL, IN THE CITY OF
NEW HAVEN, ON THE 8TH OF SEPTEMBER, 1848.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND FELLOW CITIZENS:—
I have listened with great satisfaction to the interesting report just made in behalf of your delegation to the State Convention, and to the cheering intelligence received this day from Vermont.

The approaching election is one of momentous importance. It will settle—perhaps forever—the question, whether the Constitution shall again be administered in its purity, for the promotion of the great purposes for which it was framed, or shall continue to be perverted, as it has been, to purposes foreign to the interests, and destructive of the prosperity of the nation? Whether the beneficent powers it confers on the Congress of the United States, shall be wrested from the representatives of the people, by Executive usurpation, and the means of the government, in the hands of an unscrupulous President, wasted in schemes for the perpetuation of party power, or whether it shall be administered for the single purpose of promoting the prosperity of the people, throughout the whole extent of our country, by a President who is pledged only, to walk with the Constitution for his guide, in the paths that were trod by the fathers of the republic.

That a revolution has been silently in progress, by means of Executive usurpations, and the corrupt exercise of Executive patronage, is too apparent to need illustration before an audience so intelligent and well-informed. And that the Executive power has become strengthened by the subserviency of the party which sustains it, so as to require the united efforts of the people to preserve their liberties, is no less apparent. It needs no fur-

ther evidence than the action of the Baltimore convention, and the letter of its candidate accepting the nomination for the Presidency.

The present administration began its career with the country at peace, and in prosperity. Its commencement was signalized by an act of palpable fraud, the particulars of which have been but recently disclosed to the public by those who now claim to have been its victims—one of them a Senator from our own State.

Its history has been marked by a bloody war, the sequel of that fraud,—a war unconstitutionally commenced, and carried on, in which the lives of more than 30,000 citizens have been sacrificed, and more than \$100,000,000 of the treasures of the nation diverted from their proper uses.

It was commenced by the President,—not by Congress, though in session at the time. It was waged at this enormous cost, for foreign conquest, by an administration who deny to the representatives of the people the right to expend a dollar of their money, to improve and render safe, the great channels of intercourse, and thoroughfares of commerce in our own country. It was a crusade for the acquisition of powers of government over a foreign people, contrary to the genius and first principles of our own institutions, which are based upon the great truths of the declaration of Independence, that sovereignty is inalienable, and that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; “a declaration that demolished at a stroke the lawfulness of all governments founded on conquest.” Its acquisition, with the exception of the port of St. Francisco, on the Pacific, is of no earth-

ly benefit to us, but threatens, on the contrary, to bring upon us, what, sooner or later, is sure to follow the injustice of nations—the retributive justice of Heaven.

This is but the beginning of a policy which, if not arrested now by the people, will go on conquering and annexing, until a magnificent empire, with a despot at its head, shall be substituted for the Republic of Washington.

General Cass is the exponent and sustainer of this policy, and will extend and perpetuate it, if elected to the Presidency. He represents the party that makes the Executive the controlling power in the government, for peace or war, at home and abroad. He has sustained him in the exercise of a more than regal control, in the conduct of the war, and in the appropriation to himself of all the rights of a conqueror, throughout the whole extent of the Mexican territories subjected to our arms. He has sustained him in the formation of governments over those territories; in the establishment of a tariff; the levying of taxes; the seizure of all the sources of public revenue, and in the application of the proceeds, without any appropriation by Congress, to the support of the army. He has maintained, in defence of the President, that the Constitution does not extend to the enemy's country, and that the President in the exercise of the rights of the conqueror abroad, is free from the limitations and restraints imposed by the Constitution for the security of the American people; that, as commander-in-chief, he had, in consequence of the declaration of war, an unlimited power in Mexico—unlimited, except by the restrictions imposed by the law of nations, and might do any act in the prosecution of the war, which was properly incident to a state of war.

Fellow citizens, if such a power exists in the President, it is incompatible with the liberties of the people, and subversive of all the safeguards erected by our fathers for their protection. It is not so. The President, like every other functionary of the Government, derives all his powers from the Constitution. He represents just so much of the sovereign power of the people, as they have thought proper to confide in him by that instrument, and no more. They never intended to confer upon him the Kingly power he has exercised. The statesmen who framed it, were well aware of the propensity to war, by which the executive department in every government is distinguished, and they intended to guard against it. Hence they provided that Congress—not the President—should have power to declare war, and to make rules concerning captures on land and water: that Congress—not the President—should have power to raise and support armies. So jealous were the people of those

days, of Executive power and aggrandizement in time of war:—so fearful of the corrupting influence of Executive patronage upon the Congress that might declare it, that they expressly prohibited Congress from making any appropriation of money for the support of the army for a longer term than two years. This was for the purpose of securing to the people, at every new election of members of Congress, the power of controlling the Executive in the conduct of a war, and of bringing it to a close, by withholding the supplies. But for this restraint, there would be no power in the people to put a stop to a war once begun, so long as the President might choose to continue it, and could provide for its support, independently of the action of Congress, by levying taxes and contributions in the enemy's country, with no other limit than his own will and discretion, and the ability of the people to meet, or of the army to enforce them.

When it is considered that, in addition to these enormous powers, the President has been sustained by General Cass and the party he represents, in the discretionary exercise of the Veto power, and the unscrupulous use of the immense patronage of the government, for the promotion of party purposes, and the perpetuation of party power, who does not feel that there is cause for anxiety and alarm?

Gen. Cass' own propensity to war has been the distinguishing feature of his public life. Witness his efforts to render odious the treaty of Washington, by which our threatened collision with Great Britain, growing out of the north-eastern boundary question, was happily prevented, and other questions of great delicacy and difficulty adjusted, in a manner which added new luster to the exalted reputation of the great statesman of New England. Witness, also, his persistence in endeavors to rekindle the dying embers of national jealousies and animosities, and to prepare the hearts of the people for war with Great Britain, for Oregon, up to 54° 40'; witness his cupidity for conquest in Mexico, and the complacency with which he seemed to regard even the destruction of the nationality of that Republic;—his avowed desire for larger acquisition of territory, expressing, at the time of giving his assent to the treaty, his preference for a boundary extending to the Sierra Madre.

That General Cass contemplates future acquisitions of Territory as desirable, no one can doubt, who has read his speeches during the last session, in relation to the war with Mexico, and the proposed intervention in the affairs of Yucatan.

It is my deliberate conviction, that if he should be elected to the Presidency, his administration will not close without being signalized by another annexation of territory

to the Sierra Madre at least,—perhaps of Cuba.

Gen. Cass has openly avowed his hostility to the prohibition of slavery by Congress, in any territory acquired, or hereafter to be acquired, by the United States. He has declared that he deems it unwarranted by the Constitution. Should Congress, therefore, apply the ordinance of 1787—to which the great States which have been formed out of the north-western Territory, are indebted for their giant growth and unexampled prosperity—to New Mexico and California, as they have done to Oregon, he will interpose his Veto to prevent it.

In a letter from Washington, dated the 19th of February, 1847, to R. S. Wilson, Esq., of Michigan, he says: "The Wilmot proviso will not pass the Senate. It would be death to the war—death to all hopes of getting an acre of land—death to the Administration, and death to the Democratic party. It was not so intended. It no doubt originated with proper feelings; but things have now come to such a pass that its adoption will produce these effects. It is distinctly avowed by the Southern members of Congress, that they would not vote for any measures for the prosecution of the war, nor would they ratify any treaty if this provision becomes a law. It will probably go back from the Senate to the House, where I hope the appropriation will pass *without any proviso*."

And in his letter of the 24th of December last, to Mr. Nicholson of Tennessee, he says distinctly, "*I am opposed to the exercise of any jurisdiction by Congress over this matter*."

In the platform of the Baltimore Convention it is declared that all efforts made "to induce Congress to interfere *with questions of slavery, or to take incipient steps in relation thereto*, are calculated to lead to the most alarming consequences, &c., and ought not to be countenanced by any friend of our political institutions." To this platform Gen. Cass has given his unqualified assent. To what does it refer? Not to slavery in the States, but to "*questions of slavery*" anywhere. Nobody supposes that Congress has anything to do with slavery in the States. That is a matter of domestic policy, which it belongs to the States exclusively to regulate for themselves, according to their own notions of policy or propriety, and on their own responsibility. There was no call for such a declaration by the Baltimore Convention in regard to slavery in the States. The great pending question, at the time of the session of that Convention, was in relation to the prohibition of slavery in *Territories now free*. And it is in relation to these, that the issue is presented by that platform to the American people, to decide by the election or rejection of Gen. Cass, as their candidate for the Presidency.

Should General Cass be elected, it would be a triumph of the principles and policy he has maintained, and of all the party doctrines to which he has given his adhesion, by the popular vote. It would become, by the verdict of the American people, the settled construction of the Constitution. If such be the desire of any of you, fellow citizens, you have only to give your votes for General Cass, and so far as you are concerned the issue will be decided.

Gen. Zachary Taylor, on the other hand who is presented to you by the Philadelphia Convention, as the Whig candidate for the Presidency, is governed by higher and holier principles. He is the advocate of no principle or policy, on the ground that it will promote the success, or that its opposite will cause the defeat of any party.

Like Washington, "though a whig," though he declares that "he will ever be devoted, in his individual opinion, to the principles of that party," though "he would have voted for Henry Clay at the last Presidential election," he tells the American people that he can never consent to be the mere President of a party. Who would desire that he should be? He has no private purposes to accomplish, no party projects to build up, no enemies to punish, *nothing to serve but his country*. This is the substance of all his declarations. To you, fellow citizens who are whigs, what better or more comprehensive declaration of his principles could you desire, than he gives you when he declares, in the face of the country, "I AM A WHIG, and shall, in my individual opinion, ever be devoted to the *principles of that party*," "Had I voted at the last Presidential election, I should voted for Henry Clay." At the election of 1840, he was in favor of Wm. Henry Harrison for the Presidency. What more, I ask again, can any Whig desire to satisfy him that General Taylor is as good a Whig as himself?

In his letter to Capt. Alison of the 28th of April last, while proceeding to state the great cardinal principles which will regulate his political life, General Taylor reiterates what he has often said before, "That he is a WHIG:—that if elected he would not be the mere President of a party; that he would endeavor to act independent of party dominion; and untrammelled by party schemes." Though a warrior by profession, he declares himself a friend of peace, opposed to war, which he looks upon at all times and under all circumstances, as a national calamity, to be avoided if compatible with national honor.

Conquest is, in his opinion, incompatible with the principles of our government, which, "as well as its true policy, he declares to be opposed to the subjugation of other nations, and the dismemberment of other countries by

conquest." This is the ground on which the Whig party have uniformly stood. It was one of the grounds on which the Whig Senators who voted against the ratification of the treaty mainly rested their opposition.

I submitted, myself, a motion to amend the Treaty by inserting a provision that "no part of the sum of \$12,000,000 stipulated to be paid to Mexico in consideration of the cession of New Mexico and California, should be deemed payable, until the assent of the people and governments thereof, respectively, should be *freely given to such cession*, and communicated to the President." I offered the proposition believing that the Republic of Mexico had no more right to cede those departments, than our own government would have to cede the state of Connecticut, to another sovereignty. Nearly all the Whigs in the Senate voted for the amendment, while, with a single exception, all the administration members recorded their votes against it.

General Taylor is not only opposed to war and conquest, but to all extension of our territory, deeming it a wiser policy to improve what we already possess, than to increase it by bringing into the Union a people, not homogeneous with our own, who are loyal in their attachment to their former government and hostile in feeling to ours. In the words of Washington, he asks: "Why should we quit our own to stand on foreign soil?" This has hitherto been the policy of the Whig party; and in my opinion the good of the country requires that it shall be cherished and sustained.

In regard to the VETO POWER, Gen. Taylor is explicit in the declaration of his opinions. He accords fully in the sentiments which have ever been maintained by the Whig party on this subject; "that it is a high conservative power which ought never to be exercised, except in cases of clear violation of the Constitution, or manifest haste or want of consideration; and that the personal opinions of the President ought not to control the action of Congress upon questions of domestic policy, nor ought his objections to be interposed, where questions of constitutional power have been settled by the various departments of government and acquiesced in by the people." What more I ask, can you properly require or expect from a candidate for the Presidency? It would add nothing to the strength of my conviction in regard to the action of General Taylor, if he were to make an explicit declaration of his sentiments upon every question of public policy, upon which Congress may be called to legislate during his administration. It is quite sufficient for me that he has stated with clearness, the cardinal principles which will guide him, and that those principles faithfully carried

out, as I have no doubt they will be, must lead to the result which we all desire.

In regard to the prohibition of slavery in the territories, the ordinance of 1787 was confirmed and re-enacted by the first Congress convened under the Constitution in 1789. The power of Congress was re-affirmed, and exercised by the act of the 6th of March 1820, for the exclusion of slavery in the territory ceded by France, above 36° 30', with the approval of President Monroe and his cabinet; and again by the act of the last session, approved by President Polk, for the organization of a territorial government in Oregon. How then is it possible that any one, with a knowledge of the opinions of General Taylor, as declared by himself, in regard to the veto power, can doubt that he will sign any bill which may be passed by Congress, extending the same prohibition to the territories of California and New Mexico? In my opinion, his language, though general, as it ought to be, in the statement of the principles which will govern him, is too precise and explicit in its terms, and too comprehensive, to leave any room for doubt or uncertainty to rest upon his action.

In regard to the qualifications of Gen. Taylor, those who know him best, and have watched most closely his conduct, in all the trying vicissitudes of his life, entertain no doubt of his fitness to discharge with honor the duties of any station, however exalted, to which he may be called by his country. They tell you that General Taylor is an honest man, a man of great abilities, a man of learning, deeply read in all ancient and modern history, having a mind richly stored with that practical knowledge which is acquired both from men and books:—that he is a man of a remarkably well balanced mind, of sound judgment, of moderate opinions, prudent but firm and patriotic in his purposes, and in his conduct. With an able cabinet, such as he will not fail to call around him for advice and consultation, with the Constitution for his platform, and with sound Whig principles for his guidance, have we not good reason for our belief, that he will so administer the government as to promote in the highest degree, the prosperity of the country, and secure the approbation of the American people?

Individually, I am frank to say, I should have preferred for our candidate a distinguished civilian; and such probably would have been the choice of a majority of the Whigs of Connecticut. But the possession of those high qualifications which fit men for exalted stations in civil life, is by no means incompatible with those which confer military distinction and éclat. Washington was a military man, and so was Harrison. Hamilton and Monroe too, were military men before they

became eminent as civilians. Does it follow, therefore, because I would have preferred a distinguished civilian, that I cannot yield to the choice of a majority of my political friends who have come to a different result? What would be the effect if every Whig should feel himself at liberty to persist to the end, in endeavors to carry out his own individual preferences, irrespective of the general sentiment of the party? Without concert of action among those who think and feel alike, in regard to the great principles upon which our government should be administered, the friends of liberty would be utterly powerless. Hence the necessity of conventions to reconcile differences of opinion, and by the selection of candidates upon full and fair consultation, to secure harmony of action among those, whose views and sympathies are alike, upon the great national issues to be decided. General Taylor has been presented to us by such a convention, a convention of Whigs from every State in the Union—after a fair and full comparison of their opinions, as the candidate of the Whig party. We went into that convention by our delegates, claiming, and having a right to expect, that if our favorite candidate should be the choice of the majority, the friends of every other candidate would yield their individual preferences, and sustain the nomination. And they, on the other hand, expected, and had a right to expect, the same concession from us. In my opinion, not only the delegates to that convention, but all of us, who concurred in its policy, are bound in honor and good faith to give to their nominee a generous and hearty support.

But we are presented with a nomination by a *third party*, assuming the name of the FREE SOIL PARTY. Pray have not the Whigs of the north, and their representatives in Congress, been uniform in their devotion to the principles of freedom, and in their opposition to the extension of slavery to the free Territories of the Union? Have they not earnestly and successfully maintained the power of Congress to prohibit its extension? Have they not uniformly voted for the application to those Territories, of the ordinance of 1787? This is a question for the country to decide by their representatives in Congress, who are exclusively entrusted by the Constitution with the power of legislation; and by the election of a President who is principled against the exercise of the Veto power, to defeat their constitutional and deliberate action on all questions of national policy. But we are now asked, by many who have for years been actively engaged in thwarting us in all our efforts, some of whom even aided by their votes in bringing Texas into the Union for the extension of slavery, against the solemn protest of every Whig State,

to plant ourselves on their platform, reject those who have never betrayed us, or been in any way unfaithful to their trusts, and enlist under the banner of a man, whose whole life has been subservient to the interests and policy of our opposers; and all of whose principles, except that to which he has so lately become a convert, have been utterly opposed to ours. And for what purpose? The question of free soil as I have before remarked, is for Congress to decide, and we have already a candidate who will not seek to control their action.

What pray, has Martin Van Buren done to recommend him to our special confidence as our standard bearer? or to the confidence of any who may deem themselves more contentious or more ardent in their attachment to free soil, than their brethren in the Whig party? Is it his letter as Secretary of State in 1829 to our minister in Spain, Mr. Van Ness, to exert himself to induce Spain to make peace with the southern Republics of America, lest they should aid in the emancipation of the numerous slave population in Cuba, a result which could not he said, but be sensibly felt upon the adjacent shores of the United States; or his letter to A. Butler, the agent of the United States in Mexico, cautioning him to oppose "the baneful spirit of emancipation designed to be introduced and propagated in the island of Cuba?" How does that differ from the ground assumed by Mr. Calhoun for annexing Texas, lest she should be induced by Great Britain to abolish slavery? and thereby become a dangerous neighbor to the adjoining slave states.

Is it for his subserviency to the slave power in giving his casting vote, as Vice-President, for the engrossment and third reading of a bill establishing a system of post office *espionage upon the mails*, for the exclusion and destruction of anti-slavery publications? a bill which every lover of freedom should have sought the earliest opportunity to scout from the legislative halls, as a gross violation of the Constitution, which declares that "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press?"

Is it for the attempt he made in his inaugural address—in pursuance of an antecedent pledge—to influence the action of Congress against the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, by threatening his Executive Veto in advance? When, before, was the Executive Veto thus brought to bear upon the future action of Congress? Have you forgotten, fellow citizens, the indignant feelings it excited in the northern States? when the eloquent and highminded Legget—who may be regarded as the father of the Barnburner party of New York,—till then an ardent supporter of Mr. Van Buren, denounced it and its author, declaring "that he seemed to regard

himself as a slave master in chief, and negro overseer, instead of the President of the United States!"

Is it the gag law, introduced under his auspices, and by his subservient followers from the north, in the House of Representatives—which the patriot John Quincy Adams devoted the remnant of his life to abrogate? Is it for this, that Whigs who are too conscientious to go with their brethren in this great crisis; are urged and expected to follow with eagerness the lead of Mr. Van Buren?

Or am I still mistaken; and is it the recollection of the course he thought proper to pursue, when President, in relation to the captives of the *Amistad*, that makes him so attractive to his new friends? What was that course! Those unfortunate men, the victims of Spanish slave-traders by whom in violation of the laws of Spain herself, they had been cruelly torn from their families and kindred in Africa, having escaped from their oppressors, sought an asylum here. They were as free, by the laws of God and man, as any of you who occupy those seats,—as the Supreme Court of the United States has solemnly declared. Seized by officers of the United States, and cast into prison,—while the thirty six survivors, aided by their friends, and cheered by the sympathies of a generous people, were pursuing their claims to freedom before the District Court, Mr. Van Buren, in his cabinet, at Washington was coolly preparing his orders to transport them to the Island of Cuba. Without a shadow of right for his justification, with no more power over these men than the humblest citizen in the land would possess, he ordered Lieut. Paine to proceed, in mid-winter, with a small sloop of war to New Haven with this extraordinary order addressed to the officer who held them in custody:

"The marshal of the United States for the District of Connecticut will deliver over to Lieut. John S. Paine of the United States navy, and aid in conveying on board the schooner *Grampus*, under his command, all the negroes, late of the Spanish schooner *Amistad*, in his custody under process now pending before the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Connecticut."

"For so doing this will be his warrant."

Given under my hand at the city of Washington, this seventh day of January, A. D. 1840.

M. VAN BUREN.

By the President:

JNO. FORSYTH, *Secretary of State.*

After hearing this extraordinary document, you will not be surprised fellow citizens, at the indignant commentary of the venerable John Quincy Adams upon it, in his argument

before the Supreme Court in defence of the Africans.

"Lawless and tyrannical: (may it please the Court—truth, justice, and the rights of human kind forbid me to qualify these epithets,) lawless and tyrannical, as this order thus was, on its face, the cold blooded cruelty with which it was issued, was altogether congenial to its spirit. I have said that it was issued in the dead of the winter,—and that the *Grampus* was of so small a burthen as to be utterly unfit for the service upon which she was ordered. I now add that the gallant officer who commanded her, remonstrated, with feelings of indignation controlled only by the respect officially due from him to his superiors against it. That he warned them of the impossibility of stowing this cargo of human flesh and blood beneath the deck of the vessel, and that if they should be shipped in the month of January, on her deck; and the almost certain casualty of a storm should befall them on the passage to Cuba, they must all inevitably perish. He remonstrated in vain."

Through the efforts of their friends these Africans were liberated, and returned to their native country. They found justice, and law, and independent Courts, to protect them on the free soil of Connecticut, against Executive power.

Is there anything in the conduct of Mr. Van Buren towards these Africans, which commends him to the support of those who now insist upon being the peculiar and exclusive friends of freedom, and opponents of slavery and the slave trade?

But perhaps, if not in Mr. Van Buren, himself, they may yet perceive something in the career of his associates in public life,—his partisans in the State of New York, as well as in our own State, by whom he is again so zealously brought forward, and pressed upon the friends of free soil for their support. And who are they, but the very men, who, in violation of what we regarded as their duty to their constituents, and in direct opposition to the sentiments and remonstrances of the entire Whig party, brought Texas into the Union with liberty to erect five new states within its borders! Did they not also contribute by their votes to bring Florida into the Union, with a clause in her constitution forever forbidding emancipation, and giving power to the legislature to exclude the free colored inhabitants of the northern States from their rights as citizens within her limits? These are the leaders of this new party, who now invite you to discard your old and faithful friends, and follow them. Suppose you were to do it—what would be consequence of any considerable portion of the Whig party voting for Mr. Van Buren? The contest will still be between Gen. Cass and

General Taylor, one or the other of whom, will certainly be elected. And what will be the issue, which that election will determine? Let Mr. Van Buren himself declare it. In his letter of the 20th of June, 1848, to the New York delegates to the Baltimore Convention, he says:

"The doctrine which the late Baltimore Convention has presented for the sanction of the nation is, in substance, that the laws I have referred to were but so many violations of the Constitution—that this instrument confers no power on Congress to exclude slavery from the territories, as has so often been done with the assent of all. This doctrine is set forth in the published opinion of the highly respectable nominee of that Convention, [Gen. Cass] who is well known to have received that distinction because he avowed that opinion, and who, it is equally certain would not have received it, if he had not done so. It is proposed to give this doctrine the most solemn sanction known to our political system, by the election of its declared advocate and supporter to the Presidency. If it receives the proposed sanction of the people of the United States the result cannot be doubtful. The policy in regard to the extension of slavery to the territories of the U. S., into which it has not yet been introduced, which has existed since the commencement of the government, and the consequences of which have been so salutary, must cease, and every act of Congress designed to carry it into effect, be defeated by the veto of the Executive." * * *

"Entertaining these views of the Constitution, I could not by my vote *contribute to the proposed sanction* of this new principle in the administration of the federal government, without, at the same time avowing myself to be in favor of the extension of slavery in the abstract, and this I can never do."

Such then being the issue, as declared by Mr. Van Buren himself, which will be settled, in the most solemn manner known to our political system, by the election of General Cass, what a FEARFUL MORAL RESPONSIBILITY do Whigs assume, who by withholding their votes or their influence from Gen. Taylor, thus indirectly contribute to the election of Gen. Cass. Not so, with Democrats who vote for Mr. Van Buren, for by withholding their votes from Gen. Cass, they contribute to the election of Gen. Taylor, and to the decision of that issue in favor of free soil.

In what an attitude do those who claim to be the peculiar friends of Henry Clay place themselves, by voting, as it were, in mere wantonness, for Mr. Van Buren, who, so late as the 7th of April, 1848, when invited to attend the celebration, in New York, of the birthday of Mr. Clay, replied:

"To you who understand the matter so well, it would be superfluous to speak of the *very wide* difference of opinion which has, for so many years existed, *and does still exist*, between Mr. Clay and myself in regard to *almost every public question!*"

Mr. Van Buren had before, in his letter of June, 1844, to Gansevoort Mellen, fully indorsed the nomination then recently made of Mr. Polk and Mr. Dallas to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency, well knowing their sentiments in regard to Texas, and all the other issues pending at that election. The election of Messrs. Polk and Dallas, supported by Mr. Van Buren and his friends, aided by the defection of Northern Whigs, who were deluded into the support of a separate candidate, settled those issues, and brought upon the country the terrible consequences that have ensued.

Among those consequences was the war with Mexico, and the acquisition by conquest and forced session, of the territories of a reluctant people, by the votes of those very leaders whom the friends of free soil are invited to follow, in their support of Mr. Van Buren. In his letter of the 20th of June, Mr. Van Buren declares, that "if no other candidates *than those now before the country*, are presented, he shall not vote for President." One of those candidates—nominated by the Liberty party, as the peculiar friend of freedom and free soil—was JOHN P. HALE, of New Hampshire. Mr. Hale was opposed to the admission of Texas—to the Mexican war—and to all conquest and acquisition of foreign territory. Mr. Van Buren and his friends could not therefore consistently support him. So Mr. Hale was superseded and withdrawn, and the friends of free soil are now expected to go heart and hand with those who by their votes and influence have brought these calamities upon us, in order to defeat the candidate of the Whig party, which always firmly and unitedly opposed them, and thereby contribute to the election of Gen. Cass, who is pledged to *Veto the very measure* they profess to be most anxious to carry.

While the Whigs of the North have been uniform in their opposition to the extension of slavery to the free territories of the Union, the doctrine of the entire Whig party is and has been that no more territory should be acquired. Establish this doctrine, and there will of course be no more slavery extension, no more wars of conquest and acquisition, no more Buffalo hunts, or other revolutionary schemes for further annexation.

The election of Gen. Cass would be regarded by his friends, and by the Democratic party which supports him, as the verdict of the American people in favor of the doctrine

maintained in his Tennessee letter. It would verify the prediction, so confidently made at Washington, that Northern Democrats who voted for the application of the ordinance of 1787 to the Territory of Oregon, at the close of the last session, will oppose at the next, its extension to California and New Mexico. And if by possibility it should be carried through Congress, it would be sure to be met with an Executive Veto. The lust of dominion will again be excited to make new acquisitions, and the curse of slavery extended forever to new and fertile regions, where it does not now exist.

If, on the other hand, Gen. Taylor should succeed, the great Whig doctrines will be established. The spirit of reckless adventure will be laid. The immense resources of the nation, no longer misapplied and wasted in foreign conquest, will find their proper application in the hands of an intelligent people,

in the development and improvement of the ample domains we possess. Our free institutions will be invigorated, and re-established; while the beneficent exercise by Congress uncontrolled by the EXECUTIVE VETO, of the powers confided to them by the Constitution; for the protection of the laborers of our country, whether in the field, in the workshop, or the manufactory, and for the improvement and extension of all the facilities of foreign and domestic commerce, will render us the greatest, happiest, and most prosperous people on the face of the earth. Let us then, fellow citizens, do our duty in this crisis. There is but one Whig candidate before the people. Let us give him our united and active support; and whatever may be the result, we shall have the consolation to know that we at least are NOT MORALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE CONSEQUENCES OF OUR DEFEAT.